

**COMMISSION CONFERENCE****SEPTEMBER 19, 2000**Agenda  
ItemPage

I-A	Ordinance No. C-00-35 – Dogs, Pets and Domesticated Animals on the Beach .....	1 & 11
I-B	Southwest 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street – Proposal for Weekend Road Closure/Temporary Removal of Parking Spaces .....	4
I-C	Walker Parking Consultants – Organizational Analysis of the Parking Services Division .....	7
I-D	Broward Committee for U.S. Soccer National Training Center .....	9
I-E	Beach Renourishment Project .....	9
I-F	Broward County Safe Parks and Land Preservation Bond Referendum – Tentative List of Projects for the City of Fort Lauderdale .....	11
I-G	Parks and Recreation Legislative Priorities – FY 2000/2001 .....	12
I-H	Request from BellSouth for Variance – Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) Telephone Number Utilization Study .....	13
III-B	Advisory Board Vacancies (See Regular Minutes) .....	13
IV	City Commission Reports (Deferred) .....	14
V	City Manager Report (Deferred) .....	14

Present: Mayor Naugle  
Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz and Smith

Absent: Commissioner Moore

Also Present: City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk, and Police Sergeant

**I-A – Ordinance No. C-00-35 – Dogs, Pets and Domesticated Animals on the Beach**

A discussion was scheduled on a proposal to amend Ordinance No. C-00-35 to allow animals other than dogs in the beach area. Discussion on this item had been deferred from the September 6, 2000 meeting.

*Ms. Susan Vogel* said she had an idea for a permit system to allow dog walking. She did not believe there would be a tremendous number of people who would apply for such permits. However, she thought there were enough people who would want a permit, and they would be aware of and abide by the rules. *Ms. Vogel* stated that she was not talking about walking dogs on the sand but on the sidewalk during certain hours, such as 6:00 to 10:00 A.M. and possibly during the evenings.

*Ms. Kathy Hink* stated that this was a grass-roots effort by a group of citizens who felt passionately about this issue. She said that she liked to walk to the beach with her Doberman every morning to watch the sun rise. *Ms. Hink* felt residents with permits should be able to walk their dogs, and she did not think anyone would jeopardize their permits by not complying with the regulations. Further, permit holders would serve as “watch dogs” on the beach. *Ms. Hink* hoped every citizen would always have the right to walk to the beach, with or without their dogs, to watch the sun rise and enjoy the morning.

*Mr. Bob Reynolds* hoped the Commission would restore residents’ rights. He agreed there was a problem, but the problem involved pit bulls and dog “poop.” However, the problem was not the pets, but specific breeds and irresponsible owners. *Mr. Reynolds* believed the situation could be addressed by simply enforcing the ordinance that required removal of animal waste. He noted that New York had resolved this issue, so he thought Fort Lauderdale could do so as well by issuing permits to those who agreed to abide by the rules.

*Ms. Valerie Kaye*, a Coral Ridge resident, said she had a permit for dog beach, and she objected to this whole thing. She stated that she paid \$3,300 in taxes each year, and she did not feel she should have to pay to walk her dog. *Ms. Kaye* pointed out that there were already laws in place requiring pet owners to clean up after their dogs, and she felt those laws should be enforced rather than imposing additional fees to walk dogs in certain areas. She considered this “double legislation.” *Ms. Kaye* stated that she was very familiar with tough breeds, but it was actually the owners that caused the problems and not the dogs. She did not think the City could legislate those people off the beach. *Ms. Kaye* encouraged the City to enforce existing laws.

Commissioner Smith pointed out that no one could walk a dog on the beach promenade at any time now.

*Mr. Xavier Cubas*, who lived off Birch Road, said that the ordinance had changed his lifestyle because he used to bring his dog to the restaurants along the beach at least twice each week. He thought a permit system would be a great idea because it would allow a means of enforcement if someone did not follow the rules. Mr. Cubas agreed the "poop" was a problem, but he thought it was unfair he had to suffer because some pet owners were irresponsible.

Mr. Tom Tapp, Director of Parks & Recreation, explained that the Department was charged with the responsibility of taking care of the beach, and prior to 1998 dogs were prohibited from the beach. That had been altered to see if allowing people to bring their dogs to the beach would be workable. Mr. Tapp agreed the dogs were not the problem. Rather, the problem involved irresponsible owners. However, hundreds of thousands of people visited the beach each year and were bare footed. He stated that the cleanliness of the beach was important, and there was a health problem because staff could not keep the area clean. Mr. Tapp felt the City should go back to prohibiting dogs.

Mr. Tapp pointed out that consideration was being given to adding another day to the operating hours of "doggie beach." In addition, "Bark Park" was being opened at Snyder Park on October 14, 2000. He advised that the City had spent a lot of money to create this beautiful place where people could take their dogs off the leash to run and play. Mr. Tapp stated that from staff's point of view, it was impossible to keep the beach clean if dogs were permitted.

*Mr. Ronald Snyder*, a resident of Las Olas Isles, stated that it was not just the beach area where cleaning up after pets presented problems. He advised that there were no signs directing people to clean up after their dogs and, if it did not rain for a while, the smell was unbearable in the Isles. Mr. Snyder thought that if there were signs indicating there were fines for not cleaning up after pets, it would make a difference.

Commissioner Smith asked the City Attorney if a trial period could be established for a short "morning window" when people could walk their dogs at the beach by permit with heavy fines for failure to clean up after pets. The City Attorney advised that the proposed ordinance could be amended. Commissioner Smith pointed out that people who purchased permits would know there would only be a trial period and, if there were still problems, the process would be discontinued. The City Attorney agreed information in this regard could be provided through the permit process.

Commissioner Smith agreed responsible people would want this to work badly enough that they would assist the Police Department and the Recreation Department. He liked how the beach had become cleaner since the dogs had been removed, and he wanted to keep it that way, but he was willing to accept a permit process on a trial basis.

The Police Chief recalled that when this subject had been discussed in 1998, he had suggested the Commission consider requiring that people with pets be carrying materials to clean up after their pets. He noted that cities like New York made it a violation to be out with a pet without the necessary materials. Mayor Naugle thought it was a good idea. Commissioner Smith agreed.

Commissioner Hutchinson did not think a 30-day trial was long enough, although she favored the idea of a short window during morning hours. She envisioned some kind of permit that was bright so it would be visible. Commissioner Hutchinson suggested a 60- or 90-day trial period.

Commissioner Katz hoped everyone would remember why this issue had arisen in the first place. It had been due to people who brought breeds to the beach that scared people. Although no one had been bitten, they were terrifying people. She did not know if those people walked their dogs in the morning hours, but that could still be an issue. The "debris" had been the second concern, and Commissioner Katz did not know who would be in charge of enforcing clean up regulations. She thought this was too great a demand on staff. Commissioner Hutchinson noted that the dog beach at the north end seemed to be under control. Commissioner Katz understood that, but this was a larger task, and she thought enforcement would be a horror.

Commissioner Smith asked Commissioner Katz if she would be more comfortable with a shorter window of opportunity, like 6:00 to 8:00 A.M. Commissioner Katz said she was still concerned about enforcement. She did not think a police officer should be walking the beach on "pooper scooper" patrol every morning. Mayor Naugle did not believe a ticket had ever been issued to anyone.

The Police Chief noted that Commissioner Katz had raised the bureaucratic issues. He said he had noticed that the 1911 City Commission had wrestled with the issue of dogs, too. The Police Chief stated that prior to 1998, the beach side of A-1-A had been clean and dogs walked on the west side. He advised it was far easier from an enforcement standpoint if it was allowed on one side or the other. The Police Chief said an officer would not be specifically assigned to enforcement of this ordinance due to the cost of the resources, and enforcement as officers drove by would be a very cumbersome process.

Mayor Naugle asked which department handled the permits for dog beach. Mr. Tapp advised that Parks & Recreation collected the fees and issued the permits. The cost was \$16 per year for residents and \$32 for non-residents. At present, he estimated about 300 badges had been issued, and dog beach was very popular. Commissioner Smith wondered how many dogs were out there at any one time. Mr. Tapp did not know. *Ms. Valerie Kaye* estimated 25 to 50 dogs on the beach at one time.

Commissioner Smith thought 6:00 to 9:00 A.M. would be a good idea. Mayor Naugle was willing to support the idea on a trial basis. Commissioner Smith thought it would be easier to enforce if it was allowed just on the east side of the road. Mayor Naugle did not think the owners of the more aggressive breeds would be out there early in the morning. The Police Chief pointed out that there would be a cost for cleanup, but a trial period could be accomplished through the current dog beach badges.

Mr. Tapp agreed with the Police Chief that enforcement would be easier if one side of the road was designated for this purpose. From a parks standpoint, Mr. Tapp pointed out that most of the people walked on the beach were barefoot, and there were porous pavers on the east side that were difficult to clean. Mayor Naugle pointed out that dogs had been allowed on the west side of A-1-A from the 1950s to the 1990s. The Police Chief added that the businesses also had facilities to clean up in front of their establishments and could bear some responsibility for clean up to reduce demands on City crews.

*Ms. Kathy Hinks* said she liked to sit on the wall on the east side of the road when she walked her dog. She felt discriminated against if she did not have the freedom to walk on the east side of the road. *Ms. Hinks* did not care for the view through cars and signs, etc. *Mr. Reynolds* wondered if there was any way for the citizens to participate in terms of enforcement. The Police Chief advised there was a "Citizens on Patrol" program available. He also noted that the existing ordinance allowed for walking dogs on the west side of A-1-A, north of Sunrise Boulevard.

Commissioner Smith supported the Police Chief's idea of using the existing dog beach badges during the trial period, and he felt the practice should be restricted to the west side of the road. Commissioner Katz concurred. Commissioner Smith felt a 60-day trial period would be a good compromise. It was agreed. The City Manager thought it appeared the trial period would take place during the season in November and December, and staff would provide a report about the cost of implementation and enforcement.

**Action:** Ordinance to be drafted to allow dog walking on the west side of A-1-A, for a 60-day trial period, between the hours of 6:00 and 9:00 A.M. as long as owners were carrying clean-up equipment. See also Page 11.

#### **I-B – Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup> Street – Proposal for Weekend Road Closure/ Temporary Removal of Parking Spaces**

A discussion was scheduled on a proposal by the Old Town and Riverwalk Merchants Association (also known as Himmarshee Village Association) to utilize some of the parking spaces on Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup> Street for temporary additional pedestrian areas on Friday and Saturday evenings. The City Manager recalled that the Commission had asked staff to conduct some research in this regard at its July 18, 2000 meeting.

*Mr. Peter Partington*, Engineering Design Manager, thought the Himmarshee Village Association was no longer actively pursuing the idea of a temporary closure on Friday and Saturday evenings on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, but they were interested in another proposal to use certain metered parking spaces on Friday and Saturday evenings. He advised that there were some details to work out as to this proposal, and the back-up memorandum had also included information on the Special Entertainment District Overlay. In addition, sidewalk cafes were an issue. Therefore, there were some enforcement and management issues yet to be addressed, but *Mr. Partington* said staff was prepared to move forward on the details for a six-month trial period with the Commission's approval. He estimated loss of meter revenues of about \$100 per weekend.

*Mr. Jim Carras*, Chairman of the Himmarshee Village Association, hoped the Commission would allow closing of the parking lanes on Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup> Street on Friday and Saturday evenings, probably after 6:30 P.M. He felt this was a good compromise that would maintain the flow of traffic while reducing speed, and it would allow a safety zone for pedestrians. *Mr. Carras* reported that the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) was considering a conceptual design, and he displayed a rendering of new sidewalk treatments on both sides of the street to enhance the village-like atmosphere of this historic district.

Mr. Carras referred to the other issues such as the open container law. He advised that the goal was expansion of the Special Entertainment District to include the south side of Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. However, he had some concerns about staff's suggestion that the Association pay the cost of lost parking revenue because of the precedent it might set. He pointed out that this would benefit the merchants, but they believed the City's policy was to encourage people to come downtown. Mr. Carras noted that the Association had some money to examine some kind of aesthetically pleasing barrier to separate pedestrians from the traffic lanes.

Commissioner Smith recalled past discussions about the great need for parking in this area. He asked if the new garage had helped address that situation. Mr. Carras advised that only 6 spaces would be taken out of service during the designated hours, and he did not think that would make or break the parking problem.

*Mr. Tim Petrillo* stated that the parking situation was not as bad as it had been with the opening of the Vogel garage. He advised that there were also discussions about handing out maps showing the various parking garages in the area to patrons. So, steps were being taken in the right direction, and area employees usually occupied the on-street spaces because they arrived before the customers.

*Mr. Jerry Vogel*, One River Plaza, stated that the parking garage had not filled yet, but people were finding their way to the garages in the area. He understood the County garage was not being filled either, but it was a slow time of year. Mr. Vogel supported this proposal.

Mr. Carras referred to sidewalk café licensing. He reported that most of the Association members had applied to the City for sidewalk café permits, but none had yet been received. Mr. Carras did not know where the "bottleneck" was, but he felt this was something that should be explored further.

Mayor Naugle referred to the potential loss of parking revenue. He stated that there were other metered spaces in the area that were not being used, particularly near the post office. Mayor Naugle was not sure there would be an actual loss in revenue because other spaces would be used that were not being used now. He thought it was amusing that staff wanted to bill the merchants for the loss of parking, yet the issue involved spaces that staff opposed placing. Mayor Naugle recalled that the previous City Manager had recommended against placement of these spaces in the first place. He felt it was unfair to ask the merchants to replace that revenue.

Commissioner Hutchinson agreed with Mayor Naugle. She also supported expansion of the Special Entertainment District Overlay, and she understood the Association was heading in that direction. Commissioner Hutchinson saw no reason not to pursue this proposal on a trial basis, and she was pleased with the efforts of the DDA. She felt this proposal was a good compromise, and she did not feel there would be a significant loss of parking revenue.

Commissioner Smith also favored this proposal on a trial basis, but he had concerns about the Entertainment District overall. He desired a future Conference discussion about the 4:00 A.M. licensing because he was not sure it helped the City. He also did not think it was fair to allow it on one side of a street and not the other, but he was not sure the City was reaping the value former Commissions expected.

Commissioner Katz stated that some of the establishments not within the Entertainment District were selling alcohol outside on the sidewalk, and she did not think they should be doing so until the licenses had been issued.

Mr. Jim Koeth, Construction Services, stated that being within the District did not permit the selling of alcohol outside. Rather, it allowed customers to carry an open container from establishment to establishment.

Commissioner Katz did not understand why use of the parking lane for pedestrians had to commence at 6:30 P.M. She felt that was too early because a lot of people went to the Performing Arts Center at that time. She suggested a later operating period. Mr. Partington said he was not comfortable starting before 6:30 P.M., but there was a "post work" crowd so he suggested starting at 6:30 or 7:00 P.M. Commissioner Smith believed that removing the parking actually helped traffic flow because cars were not stopping in the middle of the street to back into the spaces.

Mayor Naugle asked how safety would be addressed with pedestrians walking and drinking next to travel lanes. The Police Chief stated that staff would be meeting with the merchants to reach some equitable resolution of that issue. He pointed out that this was the only Entertainment District that had a public thoroughfare running through its center, but the Police Department would work with the businesses to mitigate any negative results.

The City Manager noted that Mr. Carras had mentioned separating pedestrians from travel lanes with some sort of decorative barrier. From a liability perspective, the City would have to err on the side of safety. He stated that the first inclination had been to use the water-filled "Jersey barriers," because they provided portability and protection. The City Manager was hopeful that a compromise could be reached between safety and aesthetics. Commissioner Smith asked the City Manager to keep the Commission informed in this regard by a Friday memo. He agreed details would be provided along with a recommended date of implementation. Mayor Naugle pointed out that Commissioners and the City Manager could also bring up the subject as a Conference report item in the future.

Mr. Carras noted that the Tarpon Bend was the only bar that sold alcoholic beverages outdoors was one that did it within its own property line. He did not believe any of the other establishments could do so because the structures had been built to the property line. Commissioners Smith and Katz believed the practice occurred on Las Olas Riverfront as well. Commissioner Katz did not care for the image cast by outdoor alcohol sales. Mr. Koeth added that just because an establishment was within its own property line did not mean the practice of outdoor alcohol sales was legal. He advised that site plan approval was required. The City Manager did not think the City had been very consistent in regulating, and it was necessary to educate everyone on what was required and what was allowed. At that point, enforcement activity could be initiated.

**Action:** Approved as discussed. Staff to provide report.

**I-C – Walker Parking Consultants – Organizational Analysis of the  
Parking Services Division**

A presentation was scheduled on the six-month progress report from Walker Parking Consultants on the organizational analysis of the Parking Services Division. The City Manager noted that an extensive report had been provided to the Commission in order to address several outstanding issues within the Parking Division.

Mr. Bruce Larkin, Director of Administrative Services, stated that Walker Parking Consultants had provided a comprehensive report containing about 28 different recommendations to improve the Parking Division. That report had been presented to the Commission in February and, at that time, staff had committed to implementing those recommendations. Mr. Larkin stated that about 17 of the 28 items had been completed, and staff was still working on the other 11 recommendations in cooperation with labor and management.

At 3:09 P.M., Commissioner Smith left the meeting.

Mr. Larkin noted that some Parking Division employees were present today, on their own time, because they felt strongly enough about these issues to be here. He advised that staff remained committed to this ongoing improvement process. Mr. Larkin also wished to take this opportunity to thank Ms. Kathy Dunn, of AFSCME, for getting involved in this process over the past six months, along with Mr. Gottshall and Mr. Hoelzle, both of Parking Systems.

*Mr. Jim Moran*, of Walker Parking Consultants, agreed 28 items had been identified as those that called for improvement. He described the process he had used during the study, and he thought it was noteworthy that an organization had come so far in the past six months, and he believed staff's commitment to serving the public was demonstrated by the number of employees present today on their own time. Although there were some who had not bought into the process, labor and management was reaching out to them to become part of this better Parking Division.

Mr. Moran stated that Parking Enforcement staff was now providing a much better level of coverage than in the past when there had been a rather sporadic schedule of coverage. In addition, there had been progress in reducing the number of vacancies within some of the job disciplines. Mr. Moran advised that Meter Mechanics had made efforts to realign staffing requirements, and they were working toward a more skill-based system to enhance their abilities. He said the initial report had indicated a level of frustration that seemed to be decreasing.

Mr. Moran reported that the Customer Service area had realigned positions for greater flexibility, and he reiterated that this organization had come a long way from where it had been 1-1/2 years ago. He stated that there had been a high level of paranoia and problems within the organization, but great strides had been made through the CALM process and the truly cooperative efforts of labor and management. Mr. Moran felt the employees had shown a high level of commitment and commended several by name.

At 3:17 P.M., Commissioner Smith returned to the meeting.



*Ms. Katherine Dunn*, President of AFSCME Local 532 and Co-Chair of the CALM Steering Committee, believed the Parking Division would be an excellent example of how well the CALM process worked. She stated that there had been a change in attitude in the Parking Division, and there was an increased level of teamwork to maintain good working relationships and maintaining the lines of communication. Ms. Dunn stated that there was a strong commitment on the part of employees to serve the public in a more professional manner, from top management downward. She felt employees were more productive than they had been in the past, and new training programs and standards had been developed with the assistance of other City departments.

Mr. Doug Gottshall, Parking Manager, agreed wholeheartedly with Ms. Dunn about the team building achievements of the Division. He believed these efforts would continue to pay great dividends in the future, and he provided examples of some of the training sessions that had been attended by the majority of the Division's employees. He reported that mission statements had been developed, along with value statements, and staff was dedicated to providing safe, convenient parking in a professional, efficient, and innovative manner. Mr. Gottshall stated that staff was also committed to planning, positive reinforcement, and to treating one another with honesty, respect and consideration. He was pleased to report a visible change in the organization thanks to a team effort through the CALM process.

Mr. John Hoezle, Assistant Parking Manager, said that in order to improve and enhance customer service, staff was working on some new technological initiatives. One involved the use of an automated municipal parking administration system in a Windows-based environment. He advised that this program would make the customer service tasks more efficient, and it would allow for an Internet payment system, an interactive voice response system, and enhanced appeals hearing schedules. Mr. Hoezle said that staff was continuing to remove all the mechanical meters in the City and replacing them with electronic meters, and locks and audit capabilities were now possible.

Mr. Hoezle advised that new multi-space meters were being used at several lots that could now accept credit card payments, and that technology was moving forward. In addition, a new timekeeping system would be utilized to ensure efficiency. He also stated that a parking lot clean up contract had been arranged for supplemental cleaning of all beach surface lots and miscellaneous parking facilities. Mr. Hoezle hoped everyone had observed the benefit of that contract because it had made a great difference. He said he had only been a member of the Parking Division for a brief time, but he had observed a sincere and strong effort to improve service to the customers.

Commissioner Smith asked if the meters on Las Olas Boulevard took bills in addition to change and if they were solar powered. Mr. Gottshall replied that those meters did not yet take bills, but staff was talking with another vendor and experimenting with solar power. Mayor Naugle understood they currently accepted coins and credit cards.

*Mr. Vincent Brown*, a former employee of the Parking Division, said he could not agree with everything that had been said about management considering his experiences as an employee for 4 years. Although things had changed, Mr. Brown could not say things had improved. He stated that the Division had lost a lot of good employees because of pressure and intimidation. Mr. Brown said he had spoken to each of the Commissioners about his concerns relating to poor management.

Mr. Larkin recognized the CALM Committee members who were present.

Commissioner Katz was pleased to see that so much progress had been made so far and in a record six months. She wanted the staff that had gone to such great lengths to know that the citizens appreciated the effort and looked forward to continued improvement. Mr. Gottshall stated that the entire staff understood this was a continuing effort. Commissioner Smith agreed with Commissioner Katz. He did not think he had received a complaint in months.

Mayor Naugle felt there was still a long way to go, although some progress had been made. He thought former employees could provide some excellent insights into this stressful job. Ms. Dunn assured the Commission that the CALM process would continue and was ongoing. Mayor Naugle pointed out that every employee was an ambassador for the City.

**Action:** As discussed.

#### **I-D – Broward Committee for U.S. Soccer National Training Center**

A presentation was scheduled by the Broward Committee for the U.S. Soccer National Training Center on the status of the application and request for letter of support. The City Manager recalled that a preliminary presentation had been made some months ago, and the Commission had authorized staff to do some initial work at a cost of \$25,000, with the same amount forthcoming from the private sector. He stated that the issue was at a critical point, and he requested a letter of endorsement of the project from the Commission. The City Manager stated that if the Commission approved, a resolution of support could be presented at the Regular Meeting this evening.

*Mr. Jim Blosser* advised that he was a member of the volunteer Broward Committee. He was delighted that the City had been so helpful, and he was pleased that the Convention & Visitors Bureau had also endorsed this effort. He stated that donations had come from various sources within the private sector and, since the last meeting with the Commission, the National Federal Committee had issued a final RFP. Mr. Blosser advised that proposals were due by September 30, 2000, and interviews and site inspections would be conducted in October. He hoped site selection and contract commencement could proceed in November, but he did not think a resolution was necessary this evening. Mr. Blosser added that staff had been wonderfully supportive.

Mr. Blosser stated that various cities were competing, and the strategy was not to give in to the financial structure of the proposal and specifically opting for a “soft proposal” in order to get short-listed. He felt there was a good chance of that, and the financial package would be put together quickly thereafter. Mr. Blosser advised that Mayor Naugle had provided a letter indicating the Commission’s support. Mayor Naugle felt this was very exciting and hoped for success.

**Action:** Approved.

At 3:43 P.M., the meeting was recessed. It was reconvened at 3:55 P.M.

#### **I-E – Beach Renourishment Project**

A presentation was scheduled by *Mr. Steve Higgins*, Beach Erosion Administrator, Biological Resources Division of the Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection, on the status of the beach renourishment project.

Mr. Higgins presented a computer slide program with respect to the County's Beach Management Program. He advised that the total cost of the 12.3-mile program was estimated at \$43 million, with a federal share of \$23 million. He stated that the County would move forward now and hope for subsequent reimbursement from the other partners. Mr. Higgins expected the Fort Lauderdale portion to commence in 2002. He added that the County's share of the cost was \$7 million, and he expected Fort Lauderdale to have another 100' of beach right after construction. After 5 years, it would erode back to a 50' design.

Commissioner Smith wondered if the City's contribution would increase if federal money was not forthcoming. Mr. Higgins replied that "all bets were off" under that scenario. He advised that the County would ask the State for more money in that circumstance, but the City's share was still a subject of negotiation.

Mayor Naugle inquired about Birch State Park. Mr. Tapp advised that area of the beach was State-owned, so he expected the State would pay for that portion. Mayor Naugle noted that the Bonnet House was also involved, so the State Historic Trust was a stakeholder as well. Mr. Tapp agreed.

Mr. Higgins advised that the current cost estimate was \$210,000 per mile for the municipal shares, and he said Fort Lauderdale had 4 miles of beach at a projected cost of \$841,000. Mayor Naugle pointed out that the City had other potential funding sources, including the CRA. He also thought the City might want to investigate obtaining a portion of the Bed Tax for ongoing beach maintenance, perhaps by including it in the legislative package. Commissioner Smith understood that adding smaller amounts of sand more often was more effective.

*Mr. Bennett Zarron*, of the Shore Club, believed Fort Lauderdale would receive the least amount of sand. He also wondered if an additional 25' would correct the height because there had been a drop in the height of the beach as well as a narrowing. Mr. Higgins clarified that the beach would be raised to a level of 8' to 9' above sea level. Mr. Zarron questioned the notion that the situation in Hollywood was worse than the situation in Fort Lauderdale. He pointed out that whenever there was a fair storm, water extended onto A-1-A.

Mr. Higgins agreed that Fort Lauderdale's beach has always been relatively narrow, but it did not erode as quickly. In fact, it had already been renourished twice while Fort Lauderdale beach had not been renourished at all so far. He explained that the City's beach was only federally authorized for periodic nourishment and not for initial restoration. As a result, sand was added only to conform to historic width. Mr. Zarron said the problem was the height. Mr. Higgins stated that the height could be made as high as possible, and any new erosion impacts could be considered, but anything that might negatively impact essential reef fish habitat was generally opposed.

Mayor Naugle asked when dredging might begin in Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Higgins expected work to commence in the fall of 2002, following work in Hollywood and Hallandale. The City Manager expressed appreciation to Mr. Higgins for attending the meeting and providing this report. He encouraged him to contact the City Commission if Fort Lauderdale's lobbyist could assist with issues under consideration in Tallahassee.

**Action:** None.

**I-A – Ordinance No. C-00-35 – Dogs, Pets and Domesticated Animals on the Beach**  
**(Continued from Page 4)**

---

The City Manager desired clarification on the Commission's intent with respect to domestic animals other than dogs. Commissioner Smith did not think it had ever been the Commission's intent to include other animals, but he was happy about it now because a lot of people feared snakes, for example. He thought it was best to say "no domesticated animals." Commissioner Smith noted that Beach Place had birds, but they were on private property, so they would not be affected by the ordinance.

**Action:** As discussed.

**I-F – Broward County Safe Parks and Land Preservation Bond Referendum –**  
**Tentative List of Projects for the City of Fort Lauderdale**

---

A discussion was scheduled on the tentative list of projects for the City as part of the Broward County Safe Parks and Land Preservation Bond Referendum scheduled for November 7, 2000. Mayor Naugle noted that Commissioner Moore had submitted a written request to add a house on Sistrunk Boulevard at Northwest 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which had been the home of Dr. James Franklin Sistrunk.

Mayor Naugle asked if the County had asked the City Commission to take a position on this referendum. The City Manager replied that the County had asked for a list of projects the Commission wished to include, and he was sure a resolution of support was desired. Mayor Naugle thought the entire Broward Boulevard streetscape project, which ran all the way into the unincorporated areas. He viewed it as a linear park, and he understood there was a \$3 million funding gap. Mayor Naugle believed the residents along the corridor would work hard to make sure the bond issue passed if this were included as a project.

Mayor Naugle had received some figures indicating that if this bond issue passed, Fort Lauderdale residents would be contributing 17% of the revenues, and it would be hard for the City to obtain an equivalent amount in projects. He suggested inviting someone from the County to comment on that subject. Commissioner Smith said his concern was that there were no assurances, and this was only a "wish list." He thought some assurances that Fort Lauderdale would get its fair share should be included.

The City Manager said he would convey the Commission's feelings to the County Administrator and seek a commitment for an equitable share of the bond projects based on Fort Lauderdale's contribution. Mayor Naugle requested a report so an article could be prepared about the referendum for inclusion in "Focus."

Commissioner Katz agreed Fort Lauderdale should have some assurance it would receive its fair share, and she wanted to add some projects to the "wish list." Those included lifeguards, lifeguard stands, land acquisition, and park expansion at the beach. She also noted that certain improvements proposed at Bayview Park had not yet been funded. It was her understanding that Fort Lauderdale would be contributing some \$60 million to the \$400 million bond program.

Mr. Tapp understood the Commission wanted to include funding for beach amenities, but he did not think lifeguards could be included in a bond for capital improvements. He noted that replacement of the rest rooms on the South Beach had been included, which was a major project. He advised that staff planned to study all the project suggestions and develop a recommendation.

Commissioner Smith understood there were discussions ongoing about working out the Broward Boulevard project administratively, so he did not want to take any premature action. However, he liked the concept and thought the Sunrise Boulevard greenway project was underfunded, along with the projects desired on State Road 84 and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mayor Naugle added that 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue in District 1 was another potential project.

*Mr. Bob Harbin*, of Broward County, said that parks and recreation amenities were something he wanted to discuss, but the County was trying to be very cautious as to acquisition because that could drive up prices. Mr. Harbin wanted everyone to know that if property could not be obtained at a reasonable price, the County would not pursue eminent domain to acquire land. He agreed the linear parks mentioned were valid projects. Mayor Naugle thought there were a handful of small, vacant parcels in Fort Lauderdale, but he agreed acquisition should not be pursued except by negotiated sale.

*Mr. Eric Myers*, also of Broward County, explained that the County Commission had directed its staff to consider sites with a high environmental priority, but there was a lot of money available for green and open space. After discussions with many cities, reclamation of developed parcels had even been included.

Commissioner Smith asked if assurances about the revenue sharing could be built right into the bond language. Mr. Myers was not sure language could be included based on political jurisdiction, but he believed the County Commissioners would want to see to it that their districts received fair shares. Commissioner Smith did not see support for this bond building in Fort Lauderdale without firm assurances of a fair share. Mayor Naugle suggested this issue be presented to the 4 County Commissioners who represented different areas of Fort Lauderdale. The City Manager agreed to do so. He understood Mayor Naugle had communicated his position to the County Commission, but they could work together to formalize the request.

Commissioner Hutchinson wanted to add some items to the “wish list,” including a building at Riverside Park, and lawn bowling and rest rooms at Hardy Park.

**Action:** Projects to be included as discussed. Staff to communicate with the County Commission about assurances that Fort Lauderdale would receive its fair share of the bond revenues.

### **I-G – Parks and Recreation Legislative Priorities – FY 2000/2001**

A discussion was scheduled on the tentative list legislative priorities for Parks and Recreation for FY 2000/2001. Mayor Naugle noted that a written list had been provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Katz wondered what would happen if the grant for Palm Aire Village Park was not forthcoming. Mr. Tom Tapp, Director of Parks & Recreation, believed that park would score well on the FRDAP application process, and he thought it had a good chance of approval. He noted that there was bond money available if the grant was not obtained, but the chances were good, and this would free money for other bond projects.

**Action:**           Approved.

**I-H – Request from BellSouth for Variance – Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) Telephone Number Utilization Study**

A discussion was scheduled on the status of the FPSC's Telephone Number Utilization Study and the request from BellSouth to the FPSC for a delay in implementing the FPSC's number pool rule for new BellSouth switches, as requested by Mayor Naugle. He understood from a North Florida organization that the life of "954" could be extended for another 2 to 3 years without 10-digit dialing if switches were added.

*Mr. Vic Beninate*, of BellSouth, stated that the organization in North Florida was mistaken. He explained that 7-digit numbers had been provided in blocks of 10,000 and numbers were running out much more quickly than expected. He advised that the idea of providing numbers in blocks of 1,000 instead, in order to ensure they were all used, had been studied. He believed that would extend 7-digit dialing, but there actually were not very many spare numbers in Broward County as believed by the North Florida organization. Mr. Beninate understood City staff had confirmed that information with the industry.

Mr. Mark Pallans, Telecommunications Manager, stated that he had just returned from a conference of the National Association of Telecommunications Officials and Advisors in California, where he had raised this issue with various groups, including the Center for Consumer Advocacy. He stated that the switches in Broward County would not have a great effect on the number of phone numbers available. Mr. Pallans had also discussed this with the City's telecommunications consultant, who had indicated that this was not an unusual request.

Mayor Naugle asked how long it would be before 10-digit dialing was necessary. Mr. Beninate said the last estimate was it would be two years. However, the PSC intended to start pooling numbers in the last few months in order to improve the situation.

Commissioner Katz inquired as to the cost of a new switch. Mr. Beninate replied the cost was \$8.5 million, and there were 3 in Broward County at the present time. He advised those were slated for replacement anyway. Mr. Beninate stated that about 91% of the numbers were already used. Mr. Pallans added that when all the numbers had been used, there would still be the issue of splitting area codes.

Mayor Naugle did not feel there was a need to take a position on this at this time. However, he asked Mr. Pallans to keep the Commission informed.

**Action:**           None.

**III-B – Advisory Board Vacancies**

**Action:**           See Regular Minutes, this date.

**IV – City Commission Reports**

**Action:** Deferred.

**V – City Manager Reports**

**Action:** Deferred.

Mayor Naugle announced that the City Commission would meet privately regarding settlement negotiations and strategy in connection with Pamela Ford v City of Fort Lauderdale (Case No. 99-021261[18]) and for the purpose of discussing labor negotiations.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

NOTE: A MECHANICAL RECORDING HAS BEEN MADE OF THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS, OF WHICH THESE MINUTES ARE A PART, AND IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.